ANCYLUS excentricus Morelet. Figures 4, 5.

This is an *Ancylus* with more excentric apex than any heretofore known in the United States. The apex is one-fourth the length from the posterior end, and so strongly inclined to the right as to be about midway between a median line and the right border. The shell is horn-colored, fragile, oval, a trifle narrower behind; in outline the profile is convex in front of the apex, concave behind it. There are *slight indications* of the most delicate riblets radiating from the apex. Length 4, diam. 3, alt. 1.1 mill. Three specimens collected by Mr. Singley in Comal Creek at New Braunfels, Comal Co., Texas. The range of this species includes Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica. It has not been reported from Mexico. The identity of the Texas shells with the Central American is reasonably certain. I have compared specimens. Crosse and Fischer's figures are a trifle slenderer posteriorly, but undoubtedly represent this species.

(*To be continued.*)

CRITIQUES AND COMMENTS.

IN Mr. Carpenter's article, "The Shell-bearing Mollusca of Rhode Island," in the August NAUTILUS, page 45, he mentions the "Family Verticordiidæ," and says "not represented in America." While the Verticordiidæ are not shore shells, nor even shallow water forms, they cannot be regarded as exotic unless Mr. Carpenter's America is restricted to the littoral and laminarian zones of the main-land, and such a restriction would be absurd. Prof. Verrill reports *Verticordia* from off Martha's Vineyard and several species occur at various depths, from Vineyard Sound, southerly, along and off the coast of the Atlantic States to Florida and the Antillean region; and not only on the eastern side of North America, but on the Pacific as well, where Dall collected specimens in the vicinity of, or at, Catalina Island in the Santa Barbara Channel, California.

On page 46 occurs the following: "Family Chamidæ;" on this Mr. Carpenter comments "not represented in the U. S., excepting by fossils." This will be a queer surprise to the large number of collectors who have found the beautiful *Chama arcinella* Linn., not uncommon, on the beaches of Florida, and not so frequently the less attractive shells of the roughly sculptured *C. macrophylla* Linn., and the *Chama florida* of Lamarck (=*C. sarda* Rve.), to say nothing of other alleged species, some of which probably fall to the rear of those

above named, in the usual procession of synonyms. On the coast of California we find three species: *C. exogyra* Conr., *C. pellucida* Sby., and *C. spinosa* Sby., all of the foregoing having been collected by me personally, without going outside of Uncle Sam's farm.

Since writing the above, the September NAUTILUS has come to hand. From page 57 I quote "Family Ungulinidæ. Not represented on our shores." If, by "our shores," he means Rhode Island, strictly and literally, he may be right, but if "our shores" means the North American Continent or the coasts of the United States, he is again in error, for the said family includes, among other genera, *Cryptodon* Turton, *Diplodonta* of Brown (=*Mysia* Leach), etc., and some authors include *Tellimya* in the same family. Several species of *Cryptodon* inhabit the waters of the Atlantic coast from the Arctic Sea to Cape Florida, at various depths from six to nearly one thousand fathoms. *Tellimya* is represented by three species from the Arctic Sea to Hatteras and one of these, *T. elevata* Stimpson, has been collected from *two fathoms* depth, coast of Maine. *Diplodonta* furnishes examples of three or four species on the west coast of N. America, one, perhaps two, of which, have been collected by my own hands. *Felania*, another group of the Ungulinidæ, furnishes two or three species on the Pacific side to justify this criticism. *Cryptodon* (which Mr. Carpenter mentions incidentally in connection with the *Lucinidæ*) and *Tellimya*, it may be pleaded, have only quite recently been included in the *Ungulinidæ*; this can not be said of the groups *Diplodonta* and *Felania*.

Further on (page 59) may be seen "Family *Crassatellidæ*, not represented in North America." Now Dall has described a *Crassatella*, *C. floridana*, from the Gulf of Mexico west of the Florida coast (30 fms.), and said family is further represented by *Eriphyla lunulata* Conrad and variety *parva* C. B. Ad., both of which range from Cape Cod to Barbadoes, in from three to about three hundred fathoms. It may again be pleaded perhaps with reason, that a part of these latter facts have but very recently been made known.

The occurrence of *Crassatella* on the *West* coast of North America should have been known to him, for *C. gibbosa* Sby. appears in Philip Carpenter's Check List of West Coast Shells (Smithsonian Misc. Pub., June, 1860), an easily accessible publication; as will be seen by the date issued twenty-nine years ago.

Again, while highly appreciating the convenience and value of authentic local faunal lists, in Mr. Carpenter's, I do not perceive the

motive for, or any advantage in, his referring to the families or groups *that do not occur* in Rhode Island; for, in a list of shells that are found within any limited area, it goes without saying, that those species, groups, or families that are not listed or mentioned *do not occur*. The two hundred and sixteen (216) species enumerated as occurring in the very limited area of Rhode Island, is so small a part of the total molluscan fauna of the globe, and the proportion of families represented by said small number of species, is so small by comparison with the *total* number of molluscan families, that the inclusion of the non-represented families in his Rhode Island list, would, propriety considered, require the title to be changed so as to read, "List of Molluscan families, etc., not represented in Rhode Island," otherwise the suggestion arises that considering the size of the dog the tail is rather extensive; a homely but expressive illustration. It is of little value, from the point of geographical distribution, to know *what is not* in a place or region; the value of local lists is their telling us *what is*.

In Mr. Ford's "List of Shells of the New Jersey Coast, etc.," on pages 27–29 of the July NAUTILUS, he includes *Fasciolaria granosa* Brug. I am not aware, and I have been unable to discover, that Brugiere ever described a species of Fasciolaria. Broderip described *Fasciolaria granosa*, a Pacific coast form that inhabits Panama Bay and the general region thereabout. I should be pleased to know what shell has been erroneously listed under said name.

[Mr. Ford included *F. granosa* among species he had not himself seen, and which he considered doubtful. Ed.]

In the Century Dictionary, illustrative of the word *Abalone*, a figure doubtless representing some species of Haliotis (perhaps intended for *H. corrugata*), is given, with the title underneath "Abalone or Ear-shell;" this would be well enough if the following had not been added: "(*Haliotis tuberculata*)." Now the figure, while it fills the first half of the measure as may be seen in the title I have quoted, does not meet the requirements when the specific name is given, for *it is not* a figure of *tuberculata*, as any one can see who is at all familiar with the shells of the *Haliotidæ*.

R. E. C. S.

Washington, September 20, 1889.